

REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the application.

Claims

Claim 1 has been amended for clarification. Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of managing a high performance relational database, and recites: receiving collected data objects from at least one data collection node using at least one performance monitoring server computer, and creating a distributed database; partitioning the distributed database into data hunks using a histogram routine running on at least one performance monitoring server computer such that the data hunk substantially has a target partition size; importing the data hunks into a plurality of delegated database engine instances located on at least one performance monitoring server computer so as to parallel process the data hunks and generate processed data; and accessing the processed data using at least one performance client computer to monitor data object performance.

Claims 2-6 have been amended to correctly depend on claim 1. Claims 2 and 6 have been amended to replace "monitor server" with --monitoring server--. Claim 4 has been amended to replace "a" before "histogram" with --the--. Claim 5 has been amended to replace "a" before "target partition size" with --the--.

Claim 7 has been amended for clarification. Amended claim 7 recites at least one performance monitoring server computer connected to the network, and at least one performance monitor client computer. Each performance monitor server includes: a module for receiving network management data objects from at least one data collection node device and creating a distributed database; a histogram routine running on the performance monitoring server computer for partitioning the distributed

database into data hunks such that the data hunk substantially has a target partition size; at least two database engine instances for parallel-processing the data hunks to generate processed data. At least one performance monitor client computer is provided for accessing the processed data to monitor data object performance.

Claim 10 has been amended to replace "a" before "histogram" with --the--. Claim 11 has been amended to replace "a" before "target partition size" with --the--. Claims 12-13 have been amended to replace "monitor server" with --monitoring server--.

Claim 14 has been amended to be a computer program product claim, and to add changes corresponding to those of claim 1.

Claims 15-19 have been amended to correctly depend on claim 14. Claim 17 has been amended to replace "a" before "histogram" with --the--. Claim 18 has been amended to replace "a" before "target partition size" with --the--.

The amendment to the claims is fully supported by the application as originally filed. In particular, support for the amendment to claims 1, 7 and 14 can be found, for example, on page 5, lines 1-25, and in Figure 3. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment.

Claim Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baru et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,495), hereinafter referred to as Baru, and Razdow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,008), hereinafter referred to as Razdow.

With respect to claims 1, 7 and 14, the Examiner stated that Baru does not explicitly teach histogram, however Razdow teaches "histogram" at abstract. With respect to claims 5, 11, and 18, the Examiner stated that Baru teaches the limitations of the histogram routine (col. 5, lines 33-42 and col. 7,

lines 27-41), and Razdow teaches these limitations in a manner similar to the Applicant's claim language.

Baru discloses distributing data of a table. Baru uses a partitioning map 3 and a hash table 15 (Figure 3, col. 6, lines 1-18). At col. 7, lines 27-41, Baru states:

-- Referring to FIG. 4c an alternative method of the invention which may also be embodied in the software accomplishes redistribution of data based on workload (activity) of the nodes. Again referring to the data of the table to be distributed, the software of the invention obtains transaction activity information for all table partitions by reading the database logs associated with them (L1-L5 in FIG. 2), and generates the current workload distribution file which depicts the current distribution of workload among the nodes. The current workload distribution file is then used to assign weights to the subpartitions of the table. With this information a new partitioning map is generated for the redistribution of data based on the movement of subpartitions of data to result in each node having as close to the mean weight of data as possible.--[Emphasis added]

Baru watches current workload and then distribute data to nodes by using weights. Baru's partitioning map is provided for regulating the movement of subpartitions of data so as to result in each node having as close to the mean weight of data as possible. Baru neither suggests nor teaches partitioning the distributed database into data hunks using a histogram routine such that the data hunk substantially has a target partition size. Further, Baru is not relevant to partitioning the distributed database to monitor data object performance.

Razdow discloses providing visual display of information on the performance of processes. Razdow merely discloses displaying a histogram (Abstract). Razdow fails to disclose or suggests a histogram routine to partition the distributed database into data hunks such that the data hunk substantially has a target partition size. Razdow neither discloses nor suggests using the histogram routine to import the data hunk having a target

partition size into a database engine instance. Even if combining Baru with Razdow, a histogram is merely displayed on a screen.

Claims 2-6 depend on claim 1. Claim 7 corresponds to claim 1. Claims 8-13 depend on claim 7. Claim 14 corresponds to claim 1. Claims 15-19 depend on claim 14. Hence it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 are patentable in view of the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks and having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

If any further fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33557.

Respectfully Submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By John P. Murtaugh
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: June 2, 2005